

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants thank Examiner Blair for the courtesy of a telephonic interview on January 14, 2009. Applicants' representative Barbara A. Wilkey generally discussed the invention and the cited reference with the Examiner. Examiner Blair indicated that the proposed amendments overcame the cited art. However, the Examiner indicated that a further search is required. No demonstration was given, no agreement was reached, and no exhibit was shown.

REMARKS

Applicants have thoroughly considered the Examiner's remarks in the October 22, 2008 Office action and have amended the application to more clearly set forth aspects of the invention. This Amendment B amends claims 1, 18, 19, and 33 and cancels claim 23. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 2-19, 21, 22, 24-29, 31-33, and 35-40 are thus presented in the application for further examination. Reconsideration of the application as amended and in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Drawings

Applicants request that the Examiner now have the drawings as originally filed reviewed and accepted.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 11, 15-19, 21, 23-24, 27, 31-33, 36, and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2004/0186901 by Guigui. In order for a reference to anticipate an invention, the reference must **“describe all of the elements of the claims, arranged as in the patented device.”** C.R. Bard, Inc. v. M3 Systems, Inc., 157 F.3d 1340, 1230 (Fed. Cir. 2000). When looking at a reference for anticipation, “[t]he **identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the patent claim.**” 868 F.2d, 1226, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Furthermore, there is **“no anticipation unless all of the same elements are found in exactly the same situation and united in the same way . . . in a single prior art reference.”** Perkin-Elmer Corp. v. Computervision Corp., 732 F.2d 888, 894 (Fed. Cir. 1984). In particular, Applicants submit the cited references fails to teach or disclose (1) providing a user interface to collect requested

information that is not included in the user profile, (2) intention information describing how the requested profile attribute will be used by the service, and (3) services being members of a policy group.

Guigui discloses a system where the "Operator Hosted Common Profile" contains top level subscriber information. (Page 5, [0059]). As shown in FIG. 3, attributes (e.g., name data) are passed freely to other service providers or restricted (e.g., prepaid account details. (Page 5, [0059]). Additionally, even though data is held centrally, subscriber information for individual services (e.g. Airport Service, Movie Service) are not distributed or shared. (Page 5, [0060]-[0062]).

Claim 1

In contrast, claim 1, as amended, recites in part:

maintaining a user profile associated with the user;
receiving **a request from the service provided by the network server for user information associated with the user and for consent to use the requested user information;**

determining, in response to the request for consent, if the requested user information is not included in the user profile;

in response to the determining, providing a user interface via the browser to collect the requested user information that is not included in the user profile from the user;

receiving the user information provided by the user via the user interface;
updating the user profile with the received user information; and
allowing access by the service to the received user information in the updated user profile whereby the user profile is updated with user information which is not included in the user profile when the request is received from the service so that the requested user information is accessible to the service.

For example, if the user information requested by the network server (e.g., affiliate server) providing a service **is not included** in the user profile, the central server provides a consent UI to the user via a browser of the client computer system. (Page 15, [0040]). This consent UI includes open fields for the user to enter the requested user information. (Page 15, [0040]). If the user enters and submits the requested user information to central server via the consent UI, the service provided by the network server (e.g., affiliate server) is allowed access to the user information provided to the central server by the user. (Page 15, [0040]). In addition, the central server will update the user profile with the submitted user information. (Page 15, [0040]).

Advantageously a service provided by the network server (e.g., affiliate server) is allowed to incrementally accrue consent to user information during the user's experience with the service. (Page 15, [0040]).

The Examiner, on page 3 of the Office action, asserts [0059]-[00062] of Guigui teaches **providing a user interface via the browser to collect the requested user information that is not included in the user profile from the user** as recited in the claim. However, as explained above, [0059]-[00062] merely teach a system for collecting profile information in a central depository. Furthermore, [0059]-[00062] fails to teach **determining, in response to the request for consent, if the requested user information is included in the user profile and providing a user interface to collect requested user information that is not included in the user profile** as recited in the claim. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Guigui does not anticipate the claims because Guigui does not disclose or suggest each and every element of the amended claims. Additionally, claims 19 and 33 include similar subject matter. Hence, the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-6, 11, 15-21, 23-24, 27, 31-34, 36, and 40 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Guigui should be withdrawn.

Claim 19

Claim 19 includes the subject matter of claim 1 and further recites "said authentication server being further configured to execute computer executable instructions for providing a user interface ... **wherein the user interface provided by the authentication server displays a user-selectable option for viewing intention information associated with the requested first profile attribute, said intention information describing how the requested first profile attribute will be used by the requested first service**" and "said authentication server being further configured to execute computer executable instructions for providing a user interface ... **wherein the user interface provided by the authentication server displays a user-selectable option for viewing intention information associated with the requested second profile attribute, said intention information describing how the requested second profile attribute will be used by the requested second service.**" (See, Specification, pages 21-22, Table 2). The Examiner, on page 4 of the Office action, asserts [0059]-[00062] of Guigui teaches **the user interface provided by the authentication server displays a user-selectable option for viewing intention information associated with the requested first profile attribute, said**

intention information describing how the requested first profile attribute will be used by the requested first service as recited in the claim. However, as explained above, [0059]-[00062] merely teach a system for collecting profile information for a plurality of services in a central depository. Furthermore, [0059]-[00062] fails to teach "**intention information describing how the requested first profile attribute will be used by the requested service.**" Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Guigui does not disclose or suggest each and every element of the amended claims. Hence, the rejection of claims 19, 21, 24, 27, 31, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Guigui should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4, 8-10, 12-14, 22, 26, 28-30, 35, and 38-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guigui in view of U.S. Patent Application Number 2002/0023059 by Bari et al. (hereinafter Bari). And, Claim 7, 25, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guigui in view of U.S. Patent Application Number 2005/0076233 by Aarts et al. (hereinafter Aarts). Bari teaches a method for storing and managing personal data for user over a network. Aarts teaches a method of displaying retention information. However, the cited art, alone or in combination, fail to teach or make obvious "**determining, in response to the request for consent, if the requested user information is not included in the user profile**" and "**in response to the determining, providing a user interface via the browser to collect the requested user information that is not included in the user profile from the user**" as recited in the claims. Hence, the rejection of claims 4, 7-10, 12-14, 22, 25, 26, 28-30, 35, and 37-39 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that the claims are allowable for at least the reasons set forth herein. Applicants thus respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance and respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

Although the prior art made of record and not relied upon may be considered pertinent to the disclosure, none of these references anticipates or makes obvious the recited aspects of the invention. The fact that Applicants may not have specifically traversed any particular assertion by the Office should not be construed as indicating Applicants' agreement therewith.

Applicants wish to expedite prosecution of this application. If the Examiner deems the application to not be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the application in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or overpayment of any required fee during the entire pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank R. Agovino/

Frank R. Agovino, Reg. No. 27,416
SENNIGER POWERS LLP
100 North Broadway, 17th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
(314) 345-7000

FRA